THE PRESBYTERIAN ADVANCE

PUBLISHED WEEKLY $2.50 PER YEAR

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

PRESBYTERIAN BUILDING, 150 FOURTH AVENUE, N.

ONLY JOURNAL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U. S. A. WEST OF PITTSBURGH

CENTRALLY PUBLISHED: CIRCULATED NATIONALLY AND IN FOREIGN LANDS

JAS. E. CLARKE, EDITOR
JAMES V. CLARKE, MANAGING EDITOR

November 16, 1929

Dr. William Courtland Robinson,
First Presbyterian Church,
Delhi, New York.

My dear Dr. Robinson:

I wonder if you would be willing to favor The Presbyterian Advance with an article setting forth the reasons in opposition to the overture before the church with regard to the admission of women to official positions.

I think it practidally certain that you know the editorial attitude of The Advance on several questions, which is not just your attitude. At the same time we do endeavor, while we retain and express our own opinions, to give to readers both sides of any such important question. I have the promise of an article in favor of admitting women by a widely known minister and educator, who is conservative in his thought, and known by all to be a man of fine spirit -- a real brother to every other minister.

I want to get a man of similar standing and character on the other side and I feel that you will be such a man. We do not want anything in the way of acrimonious debate, but I do want articles setting forth the reasons pro and con and I understand that you are conscientiously opposed to the administration of women.

Would you be willing to undertake the kind of article that I suggest as a contribution to the cause? I say contribution because The Advance is compelled to follow the rule of not paying for general articles -- not for anything except stories and some special reports. However, it will be a real contribution in another sense -- that I am sure an article from you would give to our readers a fair summary of the objections (and I recognize that there are objections) to the proposed inovation. If you can undertake this service your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Very cordially yours,

Jas. E Clarke

JEC:RS

JOHN D. CLARKE
34TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
NEW YORK

COUNTIES:
BROOME
CHENANGO
DELAWARE
OTSEGO

MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

December 3,1929

Rev. W. C. Robinson,
Delhi, N. Y.

Dearly beloved Dominie:

Here is my check for $25.00 in your favor. Please put it to such use with the poor in our church as you think would be helpful.

I keep busy as ever and leave tonight for three speeches in Broome County as the leaders have said nothing to make it necessary for me to be here will come up.

Will see you at Christmas, meantime you and yours have my affectionate greeting.

Regards,

John D. Clarke

JDC:MLH

JOHN D. CLARKE

THE PRESBYTERIAN ADVANCE

PUBLISHED WEEKLY $2.50 PER YEAR

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

PRESBYTERIAN BUILDING, 150 FOURTH AVENUE, N.

ONLY JOURNAL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U. S. A. WEST OF PITTSBURGH

CENTRALLY PUBLISHED; CIRCULATED NATIONALLY AND IN FOREIGN LANDS

JAS. E. CLARKE, EDITOR
JAMES V. CLARKE, MANAGING EDITOR

November 25, 1929

Dr. W. Courtland Robinson,
First Presbyterian Church,
Delhi, New York.

My dear Dr. Robinson:

I just have your favor of November 21 and probably should apologize because I did not write more fully in my original letter to you.

That letter was to you alone. I am not trying to get several articles, but just one. Here is the whole sitatuion: I feel that there are legitimate arguments both for and against the admission of women. I also feel, from general experience and, indeed, from articles already sent on the subject, that it is all too easy to receive many articles which contain hasty and critical comments and which may be in the wrong spirit. I refer to articles on both sides, not on one alone.

In view of what precedes I made up my mind that I would try to get just two rather complete articles, one in favor and one against the admission of women, and that I would try to get them from men who are known throughout the church as men of conservative theological views and conservative in their general attitude, but who are also known as men of high Christian character, who would not reveal unbrotherliness toward those who disagree with them. Having secured two such articles, my purpose is to limit other discussions to brief expressions of opinion which might go in what we call our Observations and Opinions Department.

I secured the promise of an article on the Affirmative side from Dr, Samuel T. Wilson, president of Maryville College. I then wrote our mutual friend, Dr. W. L. McEwan, knowing that he was opposed to the admission of women, and asking if he would prepare an article on the other side, but that if he could not do so I would appreciate it if he would suggest to me some men he knew to be opposed, but who were men of his own fine Christian spirit. Dr. McEwan replied that, because of the burdens upon him and the orders of his physician, he felt that he could not undertake the task. He suggested three possible men. You were one of them -- which gave me my first information that you were opposed to the admission of women -- and of the three mentioned I felt that I would rather have you undertake the task if you would kindly consent to do so. Therefore, I wrote to you.

That is the whole story. With the exception of Dr. McEwan, no-one has been asked to provide such an article on the negative side and, in view of the way you write, I am doubly glad that the request went to you and I am going to depend upon you to provide for readers of The Presbyterian Advance an article which will marshall the sound arguments against the admission of women.

There is no great hurry, though if it is possible I would be glad to have the article before the end of December, that it may be used early in the new year. I would prefer, though that it should not exceed three thousand words in length, but that amount of space will be given gladly if it seems necessary to use that much in order to present the argument.

Thanking you very heartily for your courteous and fraternal reply, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Jas. E Clarke

JEC:RS

EDITORIAL ROOMS

THE PRESBYTERIAN

1217 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA

Southwest Harbor, Maine

Dear Dr. Robinson:

I have been intending to answer your good letter ever since coming here about the first of July. However it is easy to put things off especially when one is on a vacation that I have neglected to do so. I expect to be here until after Labor Day.

One reason why I have not written is, I suppose, because I hardly know what to write in view of the muddled situation. I would like to have an opportunity to talk matters over, as I am sure our sympathies are fundamentally the same, but I confess I don't know just where I am at in the present situation.

No doubt you have heard of the proposed new Seminary. There were a number of conferences which I attended before coming here but we seemed to get nowhere and I came here feeling that there was no probability that a new Seminary would be started this Fall. However matters moved more rapidly after I left and the project now seems to be definitely launched. But as my information is based on reports received, I have little information other than that printed in the Presbyterian. The origonal thought was to have as many as possible of the old Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary on the new Board but as the matter is now being pushed by a somewhat different group than at first I don't know just what the situation is. Dr. Brank strongly favored a new Seminary and I trust the project also has your approval. Macartney has not committed himself, as far as I have learned, but indications are that he will throw in his lot with McEwan and Laird.

The division relative to the Seminary, as was perhaps to be expected, has extended to "The Presbyterian". It is even possible that a majority of the Directors of the Presbyterian Publishing Company will back McEwan at our next meeting rather than myself. As a result my own future activities are uncertain.

I have looked into the legal situation but while the lawyers all say that the action of the Assembly was highly irregular none of them seem at all certain that the Courts would declare it null and void. I have an opinion from one of the leading law firms of New Jersey to the effect that the new Board of Thirty-three has no legal standing but that what the Assembly did, legally, was to place the educational interests of the Seminary in the hands of the Board of Trustees, however constituted. Hence that the old Board of Trustees are the only body that has a legal right to control pending the securing of the charter amendments.

With all good wishes, I am

August 7, 1929

Very sincerely yours

Samuel G. Craig

2438 N. 19 St. Phila Pa
May 3. '29

My dear Robinson: Isn't that Princeton affair awful? Is that Majority report the best that could be done? To say that I am surprised is to put it mildly. Couldn't some of you withdraw from the Majority report and sign up with the minority? At the Assembly before any reports are read couldn't some one move that the whole Princeton affair be laid on the table indefinitely and give the church rest. I think that such a move would appeal to the Assembly.

But if the report has to go before the Assembly then some one should move that the merger plan be stricken out, because if not illegal it involves

litigation. I don't think the church is anxious for litigation.

I hope and pray that Princeton may not pass, as she surely will if a merger of the boards is permitted. When that happens then I am in favor of a reconstruction of all evangelical churches into two bodies, modernist, and conservative. It looks as if that will be the final outcome. We are probably in for a period of rationalism in America as it was in Germany a hundred years ago. Hope you are well. Best regards

Yours truly

David S. Clark

Sorry you ever left Phila.

EDITORIAL ROOMS

THE PRESBYTERIAN

1217 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA

73 Stockton Street
Princeton, N.J.

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

I have been so busy in connection with the preparation of the minority report that I have not found time to make any reply to your letter of March 26th. However that labor is over as the galley proofs were corrected yesterday. Those who have signed are Alexander, Beach, Brownson, Burrell, Crane, Hodge, Inglis, Macartney, Stevenosn and myself. Others expressed their sympathy so far as to say they would not sign the majority report but as it will appear in the Blue Book it will contain but ten names - ten names, however, which in my judgment will carry considerable weight. No doubt you will receive a copy of our minority report soon. I am sure that you will feel that your name ought to be attached thereto.

I am at a loss to understand why you should be "surprised and shocked" at my saying that I preferred to the Thompson report to the Group report in view of what I said in the Supplement to my Memorandum. I certainly tried to make that point clear and to indicate my reasons for so thinking. In the thought that the copy I sent you may have gone astray I am enclosing another copy.

I am also at a loss to account for your apparent confidence that the majority report of the Board "will be adopted overwhelmingly by the Assembly". In my judgment it has far less likelihood of being adopted than has either the Thompson report or the minority report. Whatever action the Assembly takes I do not anticipate that it will adopt the majority report.

I am equally at a loss to understand why you think that the adoption of the majority report - assuming such a ~~xxxxxxx~~ strange thing should happen - would have a tendency to ~~xxxxxxxx~~ prevent "wild liberal action". Certainly in my judgment it would not result in anything to be preferred to what would happen if the Thompson report should be adopted.

I ~~xxxx~~ am also unable to see any argument for one Board in what you say about J.W. Smith. Why not adopt the easier way of getting him elected a Trustee or even made such by the Assembly? At any rate what will be gained by increasing the income of the Seminary, if such income is to be used in the interest of a policy we disapprove of?

I may add that I attach no significance to what Speer says about Machen. He knows perfectly well that Machen will not ~~xxxxxx~~ remain if the reorganization takes place so that such talk is meaningless - unless it be to protect him later from the charge of having forced Machen, not to mention others, out of the Faculty. Why should Machen, Allis, Hodge, Armstrong, Wilson & be sacrificed to save Ross Stevenson? No doubt the Faculty needs to be strengthened but to take action that will eliminate our best men hardly seems a good way to go about it.

I will be much interested in your judgment of our minority report. I am still not without hope that you will see the error of your way and sign it before the Assembly meets. Be this as it may I am sure that our differences ~~xxxx~~ will not mar our friendship. With much appreciation of your kind words and with all good wishes, I am

April 6, 1929

Very sincerely yours

Samuel G. Craig

Frank L. Cubley
Attorney and Counsellor at Law
Potsdam, N.Y.

March 30, 1929.

Dr. W. C. Robinson,
Delhi, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

I received your very kind letter of some days ago and was pleased to note your consideration of my attitude at the Snell dinner. When I was asked to speak I hesitated somewhat and then made up my mind that life at its best was short and there was no use of fussing over water that had gone over the dam. I concluded I might as well let bygones be bygones and the quicker I forgot the past the better I would feel and perhaps others also.

I do not know that I ever made an address in Potsdam when I received more compliments, both as to my attitude and the substance of the address, so that I feel as though it was all for the best.

It is certainly gratifying to me to hear from you along the line you wrote. Mrs. Pert was one of the first who purposely came into the office early the next morning to congratulate me upon the speech which she had just read in the paper. A number of the men on the street and some from out of town have, as I said above, expressed their appreciation. I think the whole thing is summed up in the words of that popular song which we so often sing, "What's the use of owrrying, it never was worth while."

With personal regards to Mrs. Robinson and yourself, I remain

Yours truly,

F. L. Cubley

FLC:B.

659 Newark Avenue.

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

ELIZABETH, N. J.

March 21st, 1929.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson, D.D.,
Delhi, New York

My dear Court:

It did not accur to me that perhaps my leaving the meeting the other day might be misunderstood. I had a dinner engagement at 6:30 which I could not side step and the 3:32 was the last train I could make. Otherwise I would have stayed to the bitter end. I was of course sad though not surprised at the fate of our plan. I have been very sorry indeed that you and I could not stick together to the end in the Princeton matter. I may be mistaken but it does not seem at all possible that the merger plan can win the Assembly. It most certainly must appear to the Assembly that its support is a paper support and I cannot see any Assembly adopting a merger which nobody really wants. None of our board wants it and certainly none of the trustees.

I share your consternation at the havoc our two friends have made in our old Seminary and what causes me even greater concern is the thought of what this reorganization will do to the church with its boards' activities. The Boards of National and Foreign Missions are clamoring that their support is dwindling. I cannot see anything but increasing distrust of those boards when it is known that a prominent secretary of each board has been concerned in the wrecking of Princeton.

I thank you most heartily for your assurance of affection and confidence. Believe me it is most heartily reciprocated. The relations between the members of our group have been most delightful through these years and faults of judgment on whichever side they may prove to be will do nothing to disturb our mutual confidence.

Affectionately,

L B Crane

LBC/E

L. B. CRANE.

EDITORIAL ROOMS
THE PRESBYTERIAN
1217 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA

As matter now stand nothing can be done until we get the formal reply of the Trustees to the proposal adopted by the vote of II tO IO at our last meeting. After that comes in I suppose there will be an early meeting of our Group and then of the Board of Directors.

This is all for the present at least. I have done some work along the line of preparing a statement setting forth my reasons for thinking that we can defeat the Thompson Report and get a Report like that indicated in the paper I presented adopted by the next Assembly. If I am able to find time to complete it before the next meeting of our Board, I will send a copy for your consideration and criticism.

With all good wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours

January II, I929

Samuel G. Craig

EDITORIAL ROOMS

THE PRESBYTERIAN

1217 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA

73 Stockton Street
Princeton, N.J.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

Thank you for your good letter of Dec. 26th. I have been so busy of late or would have answered it sooner. As it is I will have to make my reply briefer than I might desire.

Perhaps you have already been advised as to what happendd on Dec. 3Ist at the meeting of the Group of Six and at their conference with the committee from the Trustees. Dr. McEwan was unable to attend because of "sickness in the family" but the others were all there. The Group itself, however, did nothing except listen to the reading of the replies of the Faculty (nonê of whom signed on the dotted line) and discuss the matter in a general way in a friendly manner. Afterwards we met with the committee from the Trustees - consiisting of Synott, Stevenson, McDowell, Jennings, Pugh and Emmons (the latter unable to attend). At this meeting the members of the Committee of the Trustees made clear ~~and~~ that individually and as a Committee they were opposed to the Director's proposal and that they looked upon the report of the Committee of Eleven as the best solution of the Seminary's difficulties. They said, however, that while they were perfectly confident that they spoke for the Board of Trustees they were willing to submit any proposal we might submit to the Board as a Board. After the conference was over our Group adopted a motion that the Directors proposal be submitted to the Board of Trustees and that action be taken by the Trustees not later than January 2Ist.

In view of the attitude of the committee of the Trustees it seems so probable as to be almost certain that the Trustees will refuse to cooperate with the Directors in asking for the establishment of a single Board consisting of the two existing Boards. This means, if I mistake not, that there is no likelihood whatever of our getting together on the proposition of McEwan, Laird et al and that we must now choose between supporting the Thompson Report <u>in toto</u> and a Report embodying the features of my paper. Personally I think this an encouraging development not only because I look upon proposal of the Group as almost a complete surrender of all we have been striving for but because I am confident that the proposals of my paper have a much better chance to win in the next Assembly than would those of the Group even if they had the support of a bare majority of both Boards.

I confess that I cannot understand why so many seem to think that the Assembly will not allow the two Boards to continue in view of the action of the last Assembly - an action that was distinctly favorable to the continuance of the two Boards inasmuch as it not only declared that the adoption of the one board plan submitted would leave the Seminary in an unsettled condition but referred the matter back to the Board of Directors who had petitioned that very Assembly to continue the present organization.

While I do not think I underestimate Dr. Speer's influence yet I am disposed to think you exaggerate it. He did not dare speak in the last Assembly and I question whether he will in the next. At any rate I question whether he can do much more than he has already done to help along the proposed reorganization. I would hope of course that Speer would join with us or at least not openly antagonize us but if he does the latter there is nothing to do, it seems to me, but meet - and defeat him.

JOHN M. CRATTY
117 PALISADE ROAD
ELIZABETH, N. J.

March 19,1929.

Rev. Wm. Courtland Robinson,D.D.,
Delhi, New York.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

I have been very sorry to miss you when you have made your flying trips to our city. It was a source of great regret to me not to be in condition to attend the installation and again the reception,at both of which functions our people were so happy to have you.

I cannot tell you what a great satisfaction it is to us to have a man like your son in our pulpit. He is giving great joy to our people through his splendid preaching and his pastoral ministrations. One can readily appreciate the fact that he is a builder and we believe that our church will reach a higher standard of spiritual prosperity under his leadership. Mrs. Robinson,too,with her charming personality,is exceedingly well liked. Altogether,the little family is a remarkably fine one,and we are highly fortunate in having them with us.

Mrs. Robinson told Mrs. Cratty that she had tried to identify the latter for you. She is the eldest daughter of Rev. John M. Galbreath whom you probably knew during their period at Lincoln.

We shall hope to see you on your next visit.

Very sincerely,

John M. Cratty